UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,711	08/06/2003	Jan van Buuren	F7420(V)	1913
	7590 07/02/200 ATENT GROUP	EXAMINER		
800 SYLVAN AVENUE			PADEN, CAROLYN A	
AG West S. Wi ENGLEWOOD	ng OCLIFFS, NJ 07632-31	100	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	·		1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/635,711	VAN BUUREN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carolyn A. Paden	1794
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT I.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f ate, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. The timely filed  The timely filed  The mailing date of this communication.  The mailing date of this communication.
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31  2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ Th  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,11 and 12 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,11 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and.	rawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a deplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the second state of the second sec	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ection is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document a. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document a. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applic iority documents have been rece au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	eation No vived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-31-07.	4)  Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5)  Notice of Inform 6)  Other:	

Art Unit: 1794

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 31, 2007 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decio (0,421,504) in view of Chen (5,374,751) and further in view of Lai Ganguli (0,849,353).

Decio discloses a margarine that is made from olive oil and butter.

The spread is made from unrefined olive oil and has a characteristic olive flavour. The claims appear to differ from the reference in the recitation that the oil has particular polyphenol content and that the oil has no perceivable olive oil odor. Chen teaches deodorizing edible oil. In the abstract, the

process is indicated to remove substances that impart a disagreeable odor and taste to the oil. At example 1 the preparation of olive oil is disclosed. Lai Ganguli teaches that olive oil is known to contain polyphenols (page 2, lines 16-27). In Ganguli the polyphenols do not appear to be volatile because they are prepared by extraction into water and the concentration by evaporation of the water phase (see abstract). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the oil of Chen in the margarine of Decio in order to prepare a butter that does not have a typical olive oil bitter type flavor. Although the polyphenol content of the oil is not especially mentioned in the Chen and Decio reference, Lai Ganguli teaches that it is a known component of olive oil. Lai Ganguli also teaches that levels of polyphenols that are less than 240 ppm are hardly bitter (compare Table 1 with Table III of Lai Ganguli) and would not be expected to have a bitter taste.

Claims 11 and 12 have been added that recite refining temperature and pressure but the claims are directed to an olive oil spread and not to the way it was prepared. The fact that the oil may have been refined in one way or the other is not alone seen to constitute unobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711 Page 4

Art Unit: 1794

Applicant argues that none of the references show an olive oil refining temperature that can be used to obtain an olive oil that contains polyphenols that does not have a perceptible odor. Applicant also argues that there is no suggestion in the references to the use of the olive oil in a spread. This has been considered but is not persuasive. To select an olive oil with less olive oil odor would have been an obvious way of preparing a spread product that tastes more like butter rather than olive oil. To select an olive oil with the level of polyphenols of Lai Ganguli would have been an obvious way to enhance the oxidative stability of the oil and to provide added health benefits (note page 2, lines 20-27).

Applicant argues a temperature range of the oil treatment but the claims are directed to a product and not to a process so no weight is attached to this feature. Applicants' arguments relating to the combination of the references have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant appears to be optimizing the oil of Decio to suit his specific requirements. No claim is allowed.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Decio in view of Chen and further in view of Lai Ganguli as applied to claims 1-3, 11 and 12 above, and further in view of Baileys at page 67.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

The claims appear to differ from Decio in view of Chen and further in view of Lai Ganguli in the recitation of the presence of squalene in the oil. Baileys teaches at page 67 that squalene is a natural constituent of olive oil and provides a range of the amount of squalene that is within the range of the claims. Thus one would expect that the spread of Decio that contains olive oil to inherently also contain squalene. Further one would not expect the squalene content of olive oil to be reduced by the treatment process of Lai Ganguli because squalene is a hydrocarbon, soluble in oil, which would not be expected to be extracted by the water of Lai Ganguli.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached by dialing 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711 Page 6

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carolyn Paden/

Primary Examiner 1794

.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,711 Art Unit: 1794

Page 7